

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

FOREWORD

Three non-Communist European logicians formulated the principle upon which Soviet political-military strategy is founded. They espoused their views on the composition of national states and the evolution of revolutionary war long before Karl Marx ever penned the first draft of Das Kapital. Their writings influenced not only the works of the fathers of modern-day Communism, Marx, Engels and Lenin, but they remain the basic documents for contemporary world Communist strategy.

It is not in the least surprising that dictators enunciating non-Communist, but equally identical national and global objectives, have also been influenced by the same authors. It therefore becomes manifest that the military-political strategy which has been--and is now being--practiced by the Soviet Union and Communist China differs little from the original doctrines formulated by Machiavelli, Hegel and Clausewitz.

This paper is a summation of the tremendous impact which these early authors have had upon World Communist thought and action since its inception. Although officially denounced by the Soviet Union today, Machiavelli's writings greatly influenced Hegel, whose contributions to philosophic logic and historical thought germinated the original thesis of dialectic materialism. Marx, Engels and Lenin were all his admitted disciples and the latter is quoted as having said that it was "indispensable" for a good Marxist to first study Hegel if he was to understand Das Kapital.

The contribution of General Von Clausewitz to Sino-Soviet military strategy has had an equally profound impact upon the utilization of their strength. For instance, it was from Clausewitz that the principle of the "Cold War" was first enunciated.

25X1X6

(i)

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

It is immaterial whether the reader agrees or disagrees with the author's conclusions; the most important aspect of this paper is that it does provide a base for thought and further discussion.



25X1A9a

(ii)

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

~~SECRET//NO FORN~~

THE ORIGINS OF SOVIET POLITICAL-MILITARY THOUGHT

INTRODUCTION

We are today amazed and stupefied by the extraordinary extension of communism, which in only 43 years since the Russian Revolution, has covered half the globe. The war which they are undertaking to attain their objective of world domination has amazed us and will continue to do so every day, in spite of the fact that that war is not secret, since its doctrine is exhibited in thousands of pages in all the corners of the earth. It is secret only to those who do not wish to know about it, and invisible to the blind.

The creators of this world revolution are not theoreticians of second rate, but men of privileged intelligence and drive, with the stature of a Machiavelli, Engels, Clausewitz, Marx, Hegel, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, and Khrushchev.

Our country is at war with a foreign power, and therefore as men of arms we must begin to study the enemy thoroughly, without prejudice; coolly, objectively, and with calculation in order to determine his strength and weaknesses, his virtues, and deficiencies; to measure the magnitude of the problem which we face and to know what are our sensitive points to defend and what are those of the enemy to attack.

THE FORERUNNERS--MACHIAVELLI

"There is so much difference", Machiavelli used to say, "between the way in which one lives and the one in which he should live, that by studying the latter one soon learns to detest rather than to uphold himself, because whoever wishes to appear always as a good man ends up by perishing in the midst of so many wicked men.

"An intelligent prince must not keep his promise; when the reasons which led him to promise have disappeared or when keeping it would be harmful to him. Undoubtedly this is not a good precept if all men were good, but since they are malicious they surely would not keep their promise to you. Why then should you keep yours?"

"While it is still possible, the Prince must not leave the road of goodness, but when necessary he must know how to take the road of evil. A good result justifies the means.

"Violence is to be condemned only when it is employed to do evil, but not when utilized to do good."

~~SECRET//NO FORN~~

~~SECRET / NO FORN~~

It is interesting to observe that Machiavelli does not deny morality, although it is not respected; whereas morality does not exist for the Communists.

Machiavelli has seen in the State a "living being" whose total resources must be made available in time of war. When he insisted on "the union of military and spiritual forces in a country," when he publicized this "new spirit" which was to elevate political values above the others; when he asserted that in war "the use of all forces is permitted," and when he recommended the "spread of false news in order to demoralize the adversary;" there was really rising in the 16th century the forerunner of certain aspects of total war, although he had his intuition only on the national and not the world level.

There is more. Machiavelli went so far as to consider the role attributed to the financial circles of the nation as a weakness and not a strength. There was in fact an idea that the virtues required by war are incompatible with the training given by commercial activity, undoubtedly a long-range evaluation, since he said that "when a State aspires to political greatness, the political interests must rise above all others. The lack of fighting spirit and weakness are the consequences of worry to preserve one's personal comfort, worries which are closely bound to a society dominated by financial and commercial interests. A people can provide the soldiers for an irresistible army only when the greatness of the country and not the fate of the individual represents the highest value and when furthermore, it is ready to sacrifice all for its ideal."

But let us not forget that at that time war was carried on by mercenaries, that is that the difference between the application of Machiavelli's principles and those of present day revolutionary war is the same as between the hand crafting of a shoe and the mass production of modern industry.

Let us now see in a few paragraphs how the very orthodox Great Soviet Encyclopedia presents Machiavelli to its readers: "Machiavelli," says the above encyclopedia, "was one of the founders of the early bourgeoisie, when the social class began to take awareness of its role through its struggle against feudal ideology, religion and morality.

"Contrary to the feudal concept of the State, Machiavelli founded politics on materialism. He was one of the first bourgeois thinkers who according to Karl Marx 'began to consider the State as a human division and determined its principles, resting on reason and experience instead of theology.'

"Machiavelli saw in religion and Christian morals obstacles to man's activity. According to him, whose opinions reflected the social sentiments

~~SECRET / NO FORN~~

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

of an opposing environment, 'force represents the basis of law, thanks to which we have done away with morality in the theoretical analysis of politics.'

"As a witness to the bitter class struggle which is developing in Italy, Machiavelli in his works had launched the idea that society showed an irreconcilable antagonism between the interests of the people and those of a rich class. Picturing the social struggle as a conflagration of material interests, Machiavelli drew close to the concept of class struggle, a concept which finds its most brilliant expression in his History of Florence.

"The political opinions of Machiavelli developed during the period in which there was a sudden change in his country toward a feudal reaction and toward an economic regression, that at a time when a politically dismembered Italy was easy prey to the greed of the strongly centralized European states. It was under these circumstances that Machiavelli launched the idea of making Italy a national unified and centralized state. He considered the Papacy as foreign to national interests, as one of the causes of the country's depression and as the main obstacle to its unification.

"Machiavelli also fought feudal nobility and predicted its extermination.

"The type of 'modern monarch' idealized in his work The Prince is a defense of the methods of struggle, regardless of their nature and includes bribery, felony and assassination with a view to the installation of a strong power. According to Machiavelli, a prince must use procedures suited to the animal as well as to man, to conciliate the fox and the lion; all methods are good when they bring one to the objective.

"The principles formulated by Machiavelli under the historic conditions which we know, contain in an embryo those general standards of bourgeois morality; the cult of brutal force, cynicism, treachery, non-morality (from which the expression Machiavellism). It is precisely this aspect of Machiavelli's doctrine which the reactionary and imperialist bourgeoisie has monopolized to its own end."

There can be no doubt that this last paragraph of the article in the Great Soviet Encyclopedia deserves the same judgment which Voltaire passed on Frederick II: "that he has been depreciated only to loath others."

Nevertheless, the sum and substance of the analysis does not make Machiavelli sympathetic; Karl Marx had become quite interested in him. According to the Great Soviet Encyclopedia, Machiavelli's works already bore the seed of the strength-ideas for the secret motives of Marxism-Leninism: materialism; class struggle; forces as the basis of law; exemption from all morality; the eviction of the Catholic hierarchy, etc.

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

FREDERICK II

One of Machiavelli's most eminent disciples was in fact the author of Counter Machiavellism, that is Frederick II.

In the preface to his work, Frederick II says: " I dare to take up the defense of humanity against this monster; I dare to oppose reason and justice to sophistry and crime."

Magnificent words no doubt, but Clausewitz was to unmask the Prussian Prince half a century later when he wrote: "If Frederick has pretended to condemn Machiavelli, it was only to follow him more closely for his own convenience, and Voltaire has justly said that he (Frederick II) depreciated in order to loath others.

GERMAN SCHOOL

HEGEL

Hegel was a German philosopher, born in 1770 and died in 1831. We all know that Germany has always been the favorite land of all philosophers. They were not always clear but in any case they gave to human thought a truly revolutionary drive in the intellectual sense of the word.

With Hegel the classic procedures of philosophy are left behind. Several hours would be necessary to explore the substance of this Hegelian philosophy. Nevertheless it may be summarized in two formulas:

1) One takes a thesis (existing) then its opposite (also existing) which is the antithesis. Both are false because they are partial, too one-sided and already outstripped by events; they are compressed into a synthesis, which in turn is nothing more than a stage in the road to truth and which represents nothing final. There is nothing: God himself does not exist; world is in a state of "perpetual becoming," and the movement of history and the purpose of this movement are no different from each other, and they are only one thing. There is therefore nothing stable, there is no law, no morality, no rules for living between nations, there is only a "spiral of history" which rises endlessly and is fully justified in its very movement and ascension.

But these two formulas are given as Hegel's interpretation of the "dialectic," since the latter is not a system, but a method of reasoning which permits the tracing of all the continuity of thought in those whose spirit is gradually dragged without pausing at anything satisfactory before the last stage. Consequently this idea is at once linked to restlessness.

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

Universal history is the living dialectic, history and dialectic are one and the same thing.

Hegel taught the Germans and then the Soviet disciples to think historically. He says that everything that is real is rational. Reality is life and history. But life and history obey certain laws. All law is rational. Therefore, what is real cannot be irrational.

For Hegel the individual is no more than an abstraction without consistency, a real nothing who has no more "substantial" reality than a fly which dies in autumn or a spark which leaps from an anvil.

Only communities have their own, permanent objective, substantial reality, in which individuals are submerged, participating in the same.

The community is what constitutes "The Being."

The individual is no more than an accident, the moment.

The community (that is, the State) means that there is no subjective will issuing from individuals, but an "objective spirit" which shows in ideas above the individual.

It is the march of "God" across the pages of history which makes the state exist, having as its basis the "power of reason" and thanks to it it becomes "will." Finally, this "will" becomes action and is then accomplished in history.

What Hegel calls the "tissue of history" are the great ideas and they achieve it, and not the actors charged with executing its decisions.

The state is personified. "It knows what it wants and it executes what it wishes." It is the adequate accomplishment of a divine idea, an earthly incarnation of God.

The State does not have the happiness of peoples as its purpose, but the always more perfect affirmation of its own existence and of its sovereignty.

The Hegelian State is by definition "monarchic," but as with the individual, be he even a king, it does not deserve to be considered, and there can be no question of personal rule, and still less of parliamentary rule or universal suffrage... The Hegelian State will therefore be a constitutional kingdom, in which the king will be the living symbol of the majesty of the State. There is no parliament, but a corporate representation for the agencies of the State, a system in which light and will come from above, of the State-god.

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

It is evident that Hegel's State theory had a decisive influence on Bismarck, Hitler, and Stalin.

The Hegelian State represents by the force of circumstance a more evolved form of reason. It is the ultimate religion of humanity, a religion in which Law and Force are reconciled, Idea and Fact, the Rational and the Real are reconciled. It is the "Synthesis" of everything.

Defining itself by its sovereignty, the Hegelian state tolerates no limitation of that sovereignty. Contracts, concordats or treaties lose their validity when the interest of the state enters into play.

Since history is made up of nothing more than antagonisms, the existence of the UN or treaties of arbitration cannot be admitted, since this would detain the historical process of dialectic. Only history can judge and it shall judge the results.

The only valid thing is the will of the State to pursue the accomplishment of its designs, without worrying about the value or justice of its cause, its objectives; its intentions are judged only intrinsically, keeping in mind only its interests.

From all this it appears that relations among states cannot be peaceful and cordial, as long as the Hegelian state finds no advantage in it; for this reason normal relations with unsubjected states is war. Hegel thus becomes the metaphysicist of imperialism, but of an unbridled imperialism.

In order to dissolve the individual and utilize the masses with the intent of doing the will of the state, they shall be trained methodically and positively in the Hegelian State and negatively in the adversary states.

And when these preliminary results have been attained, when the morale of the enemy has been undermined and when on the other hand its morale has been raised to the maximum, what will the Hegelian State do? In accordance with the traditional rules of history it will be necessary to unleash the crisis and exploit it.

I think that now we shall say a few words on the influence of Hegel on Marx, Lenin, and Stalin. Everyone knows the enormous influence of Russian philosophy of the 18th and 19th centuries on Russian thought and literature. Without a doubt, Hegel has been the principal teacher of the thought of Soviet leaders. Marx inherited from Hegel two considerable things: His method (dialectic) and his finalist concept of history. Marx's contribution is essentially the concept of historic materialism, as well as a certain humanism (understood of course in the measure in which he seeks the happiness of mankind, which must be achieved in a

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

classless society).

On the other hand Lenin was also a faithful disciple of Hegel and estimated that to understand Marx it was indispensable to study Hegel first.

"It is not possible," said Lenin, "to understand Kapital, and particularly Marx's first Kapital if one has not studied, and thoroughly, Hegelian logic; for this reason there are Marxists who have not yet understood Marx."

With regard to Stalin, the vigorous exponent of monolithic doctrine, he officially rejected Hegel, as he also rejected Clausewitz, but he did so in order to apply better the concepts and ideas of one and the other in daily living. But basically the only difference between the pure Hegelian system and Stalinism consists in the replacement of the spiritual idea (God) of the first by the material notion of the second.

The Soviet concept of liberty "in its highest form of democratic states" grows increasingly close to the Hegelian model, as the Soviet state becomes stronger. This state, with Stalin's approval, now rests on a Hegelian concept of law.

GENERAL VON CLAUSEWITZ

General Von Clausewitz was undoubtedly a disciple of Hegel, as well as Kant. Ironically, both Von Clausewitz and Hegel died in the same year -- 1831.

Clausewitz was trained from boyhood in the school of warfare. He was only 13 years old when he took part in the campaign of 1793 against France. During his course at the War School he had the good fortune of being taught by Scharnhorst under whose orders he was to serve in various campaigns.

In 1806 he was taken prisoner by the French after the fall of Yena. His imprisonment gave him time to meditate.

In 1810 he was professor at the war college in Berlin. In 1812 the alliance of Prussia with Napoleon and France, both of whom he hated, drove him to join the Russian service.

From 1818 to 1830, as director of the Berlin War College, Clausewitz dedicated himself to the thorough study of Napoleonic campaigns and analyzed the reasons for the successes of some and defeats of the others. First he gave his time to the study of military history of the age in which he lived and then to the study of the eras before his time, with an

~~SECRET~~

essentially new spirit in which the Hegelian dialectic had already left its traces.

Clausewitz had attempted to define and determine what war is in its essence and consequently what are the different forms of war, the methods which are activated, how it is conducted and the results which may be expected.

Rather than presenting a limited system as did his two contemporaries Jomini and Willinsen, Clausewitz sought the permanent laws and principles of war, laws and principles independent of his age and circumstances.

He drew away from the idea that war is a psychological phenomenon. One of his fundamental observations was in effect that "war is one of man's activities" which rests on both human strength and weaknesses at the same time. These strengths and these weaknesses are what intelligence must know how to utilize.

Clausewitz then investigated the relations of politics and the military art. He noted that "war is only a continuation of politics by different means." Starting with this formula by Clausewitz, the Marxist school has put out thousands of pages signed by Marx, Engels, Lenin, Stalin, and Mao Tse-tung, creating a veritable gospel of action, but we must never forget that it was revolutionary action, an action of permanent psychological, universal and total war.

Let us quickly review these two "key propositions:"

- a) Exploitation of the moral strengths or human weaknesses depending on the case.
- b) The essentially political aspect of war.

Moral Strengths: A standard field for our military men, which Soviet leaders have mastered (and Stalin in particular), making an art of their exploitation.

The Exploitation of Human Weaknesses: He also sought to use the gregarious fellowship of the masses in his own territory in order to indoctrinate them psychologically, or the cult of fear in enemy countries, in order to defeat them; however, this fear can be inculcated long before the time of combat, thanks to propaganda, as well as during the course of combat, through false information, simulation, and harassment, creating a real psychosis of permanent insecurity.

The second "key proposition" deserves broader development.

~~SECRET~~

In his letter to Major Von Roeder dated 22 December 1827 Clausewitz wrote: "We must not commit the error of considering war uniquely as an act of force and annihilation, nor deduce from this simplified notion through a logical spirit of deduction, a series of conclusions which do not fully match the phenomena of the real world, but we must on the contrary return to the notion of war as a political act, this war which does not fully carry its own law, but is conducted by a hand. This hand is politics..."

"This discussion absolves me from having to emphasize that there can be even more painless wars, such as a simple threat, an armed negotiation, or in the case of war of coalition, a simple feint at operations. It would be quite false to expect that these wars have nothing to do with the art of war. In as much as strategy is limited to admitting that from all the evidence there can be wars which do not seek an extreme end, that is, the defeat and destruction of the enemy, it is then necessary to come down to the most varied echelons, whatever they may be, when the interest of politics requires it."

Therefore, we see here the "cold war" described by Clausewitz. "A simple threat" or "a simple feint", bluff itself, are already actions of war. For him, "true war", as he calls it, that which a half century later would still be the only object of deep study by Camon, Bonnal and Foch in France, was nothing more than the exception.

This "typical war" will appear only as an extreme case, in which politics and war are blended before the fact that the nation is staking all. It is this idea which Clausewitz expresses in the following form: "The more politics has in view the primary interests of the nation, the more it compromises the life of the same, and the more it is a question of life or death for the nations involved. More and more we shall see politics and war blending together, the former being absorbed by the latter. But it will be a simple war. It will more and more proceed on the elementary notion of power and destruction. It will more and more answer all the requirements which one can logically draw from these concepts and its parts will be more bound to each other by the laws of necessity. A war of this type appears to be completely non-political; and this is the reason why it has been considered as typical war." But it is evident that the political principle is no more absent from this type of war than from the others, but it is blended with the idea of violence and destruction, which is what hides it from our eyes. Politics disappears for a time behind the military or is blended with it."

Clausewitz's thinking is extraordinarily clear here; this thinking has left deep marks on his Hitlerite and Soviet disciples. "Politics," continues Clausewitz, "makes a simple instrument of this element which is as powerful as war; of the terrible power of war which must be handled with both hands and with all one's forces in order to strike only

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

once; politics makes it a light and manageable sword which is sometimes like a fencing foil, alternately striking, feinting, and parrying."

"Depending on the degree of tension," he continues, "war becomes more or less political. It goes from a simple show of force to the destruction of the adversary. Thus war is like a chameleon, because it changes color in each particular case."

As regards psychological warfare, Clausewitz estimated that it precedes, accompanies, or replaces even combat itself, properly speaking. Clausewitz also considered public opinion to be a military objective.

Having clarified all these concepts we find that the meaning of war has a new value, a new significance.

For Clausewitz, humanity does not live "normally" in a state of peace. War is even constant, at least latently. What only counts for a state is to maintain a clear and vigorous foreign policy and know how to force its will on others.

We can see that Clausewitz has translated Hegel's historic theories into political and military terms, and we also know up to what point the Russians have been faithful disciples of both Clausewitz and Hegel.

Seventy-five years after the death of Clausewitz, Camon, Bonnal, and Foch in France continued to be interested in more than the standard forms of war. They had read Clausewitz, because they could quote him in detail, but the political-military aspect of Clausewitz's warfare seems to have escaped them.

Among statesmen, only Bismarck seems to have digested the political aspects of Clausewitz's work, but Bismarck was quite reserved and never spoke. Nevertheless we should point out that Bismarck had a personal policy, whereas the USSR is at the head of a party which covers the whole world and because of this fact, obliged to draft a doctrine and disseminate it. Clausewitz is promoted to the rank of a great classicist, and attains this status of being the vehicle of Soviet-political-military thought. Hitler read much of Clausewitz and tried to apply it conscientiously, but it is evident that he did not always have time to assimilate enough, so as to learn to utilize it without danger. His megalomania, his morbid impatience, pushed him prematurely to the limits of the act of war, without having first learned to fence with a foil.

Only the Russians or more precisely the founders of Marxism and its Leninist-Marxist successors have consecrated the time necessary to this work in the light of their famous dialectic.

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

MARX AND ENGELS

Marx, who was born in 1818 and died in 1883, was of the generation which followed Clausewitz. He speaks in his works as in his letters of "the doctrine of revolutionary war," of the "determination of the direction of the main blow," of the "concentration of forces," of the "offensive erected into dogma," of the "necessity of instantaneity in attack."

A people resolved to win its independence, says Marx, will not be satisfied with conventional methods.

"Revolutionary tactics, detachments of guerrilla fighters, are the methods by which even a small nation can triumph over a large one."

In Marx we find a first and serious outline of the "revolutionary war."

In accordance with recent investigation, Engels not only has written a great part of historic studies attributed up to now to Marx but he also had a much more accurate idea of the forces of labor in the world. He foresaw the future evolution and thus contributed to the formulation of the fundamental concepts of the political-military strategy of the present time.

Engels' military doctrine had as its basis the concept of "the nation in arms." He thought that the armed forces could serve as the agent of socialist propaganda. In 1891 he wrote: "The true strength of German Social Democracy does not lie in the number of its voters but in its soldiers, because the party must recruit its members from young people before anyone else."

These ideas have especially been applied after the Second World War in Russia and in all the satellite countries and particularly in East Germany, where the present army is compared to the people's army of 1813 and praises are sung to Scharnhorst, Gneisenau, Clausewitz, etc.

Thus, as Engels predicted, we are witnessing in East Germany the exalting of nationalism and the military and democratic spirit which are strictly associated, directing harsh criticism against the Bonn mercenaries, as they call them. There is no doubt that Engels, in the bottom of his tomb, must be satisfied.

Engels was not only a philosopher, he was a true military critic who wrote innumerable military articles. In his opinion, the "political combatants" ought first to "study the art of war, since this

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

study is a requisite to triumph for a better future."

But he was before everything else essentially a man of action who had a broad military vocabulary and who was by nature a soldier and a warrior.

The influence of Engels on tactics and strategy in the Russian Revolution is well known. Just as Clausewitz, he had a genius for criticism, a great clarity of judgment and they both understood that the greatness of strategic thought lay in simplicity.

Marx and Engels produced a real revolution in political-military concepts which brought them to a more and more circumspect interpretation, at the same time that it was more realistic and dynamic, of the political and military history of their time. We can distinguish three phases in the development of their thought. In the first phase they combined the experience of revolutionary tactics in civil war with the military strategy of international conflicts. They applied the dialectic to the notion of war. The "thesis" is the "war of the states", a war of standard type, essentially military, limited in time and space and also limited in its purposes as in the methods employed. The "antithesis" is the "struggle of classes," a form of war which is generally embryonic and eternal according to its authors. The "synthesis" will be the "revolutionary war" which comprises the two forms of preceding wars, although in appearance both disappear. In this synthesis the inherent advantages of each is kept. Revolutionary war is in effect the most perfect form of war existing, and when well conducted it does more than assemble the advantages of the wars of states and of those of classes, it does more than multiply them by each other, raising the advantages obtained to the "Nth" power.

If one represents the advantages of the war of states by E, and the war of classes by C, the resultant advantages of revolutionary war will not be $E + C$ or $E \times C$, but will be E^C or C^E .

In a second phase, Engel and Marx studied the close relationship existing between foreign policy and the domestic problems of nations; they observe that the future revolution in Europe could not depend on a single nation. This observation brought them to the notion of interdependence between socialism and foreign policy. In this manner they faced a realistic revolutionary strategy on a world scale.

Finally in the third phase they became exactly aware of the importance of nationalisms and hoped to inject a renewed revolutionary drive into these movements.

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

Marxist theory essentially tends toward action: "our doctrine is not a dogma", Marx said, "but a guide to action." However, in order to make the world revolution a reality, Marx and Engels took note that it was necessary to set in movement a system, a political-military doctrine, in which political strategy and military strategy would be strictly combined.

Marx and Engels, disciples of Hegel on the philosophic level, of Hegel and Clausewitz on the historic level and of Clausewitz on the military level alone, are truly the fathers of revolutionary war and their doctrine is now two-thirds of a century old.

The great discovery by Dr. Blau, a national socialist strategist, according to whom modern war has four aspects: diplomatic, economic, psychological, and military, but in the last place; was a notion infinitely familiar to Marx and Engels who knew perfectly well that military campaigns can be lost long before the first rifle is fired. Further, they preferred to make war fundamentally on the economic and psychological fronts, since they knew that war on multiple fronts is one and indivisible and that it can be won or lost on the field of battle or also in civil war or simply in the changing spirit of each citizen.

SOVIET SCHOOL

LENIN

Vladimir Ulianov, known as Lenin, was reportedly the standard bearer of the Marxist Revolution, after the death of Marx in 1883 and that of Engels in 1895.

On the 8th of May 1887, Lenin's brother was executed for attempted assassination of the Tsar. From that time onward Lenin, after his brilliant record as a student, was to embrace the Communist undertaking not only with enthusiasm and hate, but also guided by a cold and calculating temperament.

It is interesting to record with what lack of scruple, with what absence of a feeling of honor, Lenin accepted the pay of Germany which was at war with Russia to undermine the morale of his homeland.

The end only justifies the means.

"I am accused of having made our Revolution with German money," Lenin said, "and I have never denied it, and I do not deny it now, but on the contrary I am going to ignite the revolution in Germany with Russian money."

~~SECRET//NOFORN~~

~~SECRET (NO FORN)~~

When Lenin took power in Petrograd in 1917 he was far from being a neophyte in strategy. He had studied socialism and labor unionism thoroughly, he was initiated in terrorism for more than 25 years, and was in a position to appreciate the role of violence in human problems.

As a disciple of Hegel, dialectic was his natural thinking, and "perpetual becoming" his faith.

As a disciple of Engels he did not doubt the importance of military knowledge, which he conceived as the media serving the people and the classes for the solution of their great historic problems.

Just as Engels, he had read Clausewitz and annotated his margins in German, but he had read it in the light of Engels and Marx, of whom he was the heir. The Marxist theories had a certain innovating value with regard to those of Clausewitz, since they went beyond them, in the measure that war took on the two aspects of "war" and "revolution."

In paragraph III of Chapter III of Book II, Clausewitz said: "War is neither an art nor a science, but an act of social life. It has much less to do with the arts and the sciences than with commerce, which also constitutes a conflict of great interests; although it is much more related to politics, which itself can be defined as a kind of commerce of large dimensions, in whose bosom war is born and develops, just as the child in the womb of its mother, and ~~where~~ all the constituted elements are found joined in a latent state, with the same properties of living beings in their embryos." This paragraph by Clausewitz is entirely marked by a single and sometimed double sideline, followed by the note in Lenin's hand: "Note."

Let us now look at some paragraphs of Chapter V of Book VI, which evidently impressed Lenin very much.

Clausewitz said: "war is not necessarily the consequence of an invasion, but of the fact in itself of a defense action which the invaded offers to the invader. The conquerer, as Bonaparte always said, is a friend of peace and will enter our country without loss of blood and with very good desired; but we cannot allow it, being obliged to ask for war and consequently we must be ready."

This paragraph by Clausewitz had three lines on the margin made by Lenin, with the annotation: "ah, ah, spiritual!" Without a doubt the preceding paragraph is the best summary of the tragic-comical international situation of our day, since the Communists are busy making it look as though Russia is the only peaceful country and that all those who try to stop her aggressions are the "infamous war mongers," imperialists, or capitalists.

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

To continue we shall read a few lines from Chapter VI of Book VI, in which Clausewitz said: "although in the majority of cases the influence which a resident can have on a theater of operations in wartime is no more visible than a drop of water added to the sea, nevertheless the total influence of all the inhabitants of a country on war is of considerable value, even in cases where there is no peoples' uprising."

This paragraph by Clausewitz was underlined by Lenin with various marginal notes. We are undoubtedly looking at the origin of the theories so dear to Lenin as to his successors; that of the "solidity of the Communist internal front," and of its counterpart the guerrilla actions and annoyances of all kinds inside the lines of the adversary.

In Chapter XXX of Book VI we see Lenin's marginal notes effusively approving of Clausewitz. The marvelous passage by Clausewitz on the commander, which says: "without an energetic and powerful directing will which reaches down to the last member of the army, no conduct of war is possible..."

This paragraph has the following notation by Lenin: "A good commander...and distrust of men."

Continuing in the same chapter of Clausewitz's work which deals with strategic and tactical maneuver, considered to be the height of the military art, he wrote: "this concept was more or less that of all the theoreticians when they examined the wars of the French Revolution. These wars suddenly revealed a whole new world of military fact, in the beginning somewhat gross and savage, but which Bonaparte transformed later into a method of great style. The successes obtained in the course of these wars profoundly impressed both young and old. It was then necessary to give up the old systems and it was believed that all this was no more than the consequence of new discoveries, new grandiose ideas, etc., but it was not so; in every case it was the result of a change of social condition. It was believed that there would no longer be need for the old system, to which one would never again return. But here as in all the great intellectual revolutions there were sides taken; the old method had its defenders who saw in the new only a decadence of the art and only manifestations of brute force in its results, etc."

The new aspects shown in the field of military art must be attributed much less to inventions and new ideas than to a change in the social condition and social relations."

Lenin made the following notations on the margin of this paragraph: "war equals game." Opposite the passage relating to revolutionary tactics he wrote: "French Revolution equals total change," marking the close interdependence between politics, social and military fields. And at the end of the passage Lenin was led to conclude with the following

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

annotations: "The truth does not lie in systems", a sentence worthy of a disciple of Hegel and Marx, impregnated by dialectic and by "perpetual becoming."

Lenin's idea was to interest the people's masses in the problems of wars and make them act in a positive direction favoring the Communist cause, and in a negative direction in the countries which are adversaries of the same. It is probable that this idea came to him from Clausewitz through Marx. Lenin formulated the following notes also on the margin of the paragraphs by Clausewitz relating to the French Revolution:

"The French Revolution changed everything."

"The war suddenly became a people's cause."

"The entire people pulled itself with all its natural weight on the scale of the balance."

"Thus, since Bonaparte's time--first of all in France and later in all of Europe--war became a national cause; it took on another nature, or more exactly, assumed its true nature, and neared its absolute perfection."

"The media to be used were thence forward more than the visible limits and depended only on the energy and enthusiasm of the rulers and their subjects."

"Important: but there is an inaccuracy: The war has become not a national cause but a cause of the bourgeoisie and sometimes of the entire bourgeoisie."

"Energy! Note: 'enthusiasm of subjects,' 'participation of the peoples.' A little later we find a wise sentence: 'Each epoch has its own wars.'"

In Chapter VI of the same book, Clausewitz deals with the influence of the political objective on the military objective and states that this influence is shown and that "it is thus that there are wars in which the objective is reduced uniquely to threaten the adversary and supporting negotiations" (underlined by Clausewitz). Lenin added on the margin: "degrees...graduations on the concept of war and peace."

Today we are experiencing this very thing: it is called "the cold war." The Communists extend their hand to us in a sign of friendship in order to continue on the following day with threats of offenses or a hot war which is localized and limited. There is only one thing which never changes: the objective.

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

If Lenin was convinced that only political and military offensive could assure victory, Stalin further knew that no strategy can be successful if it is not supported by the mobilization of the economic and moral resources of a nation. As a disciple of Clausewitz he stressed action on internal moral forces. His great originality was the training of men, women and children on the home front both from the viewpoint of industrial warfare and of psychological formation.

In 1939 the principal official propaganda theme was that the USSR, a nation of workers and peasants, was surrounded by capitalist and imperialist states. Playing with domestic and foreign fear as well as with Russian national sentiment, which is certainly a considerable novelty, Stalin succeeded in obtaining a "solid domestic front" and "armed forces of high morale."

In order to attain this objective Stalin did not hesitate officially to reanimate the call of national sentiment, which many still think was a contradiction, but in reality it was only the natural application of Hegel's dialectic, the development of which is as follows:

Thesis: Nationalism at the time of the Tsars.

Antithesis: World revolution beyond the borders.

Synthesis: Triumph of revolution by utilizing Russian nationalism, or better still: triumph of Russian nationalism converted to imperialism by utilizing the world revolution.

When Stalin died, he left an overall doctrine, both domestic and foreign, of revolutionary war inherited from Marxism-Leninism, perfectly evolved.

If the exploitation of national sentiment in Russia has been one of the essential factors in the victory over Germany, its manifestations after the war proved to be a weighty argument against the purity of Communism's intentions. In effect, if the concept of homeland was placed above that of the system, there was a risk of serious deviation both at home and abroad.

It is evident that Stalin's mode of action was justified by the dialectic of the times, but since the circumstances had changed and the 1954 dialectic was different, it was necessary to erase even the memory of the dead dictator. The Communists, as you know, are realists, without scruples or morality. In 1954, then, it was a matter of combining the requisite circumstances in order to achieve a new Communist victory in a new era.

The new strategy required was developed at the 20th Congress of

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

~~SECRET~~

A bit farther on, when Clausewitz, himself writes and underlines in the text that "the war is only a part of the political commerce and as a result it has no independent value." Lenin added: "the most important chapter."

Is war only a simple method of expressing a thought? This question by Clausewitz drew three big sidelines from Lenin and an N.B. A few lines farther on Lenin wrote: "war equals part of a whole: this whole equals politics."

International politics cannot attain its objectives without war, whether it be called "cold war", "threat", "armed show of force" and so forth; but it is no less certain that none of these forms of warfare would attain its proposed objective if it were not really supported by a positive force. For this reason we see antimilitarist Lenin in the epoch of the Tsar create a Red Army when the Communists seized power, and for the same reason all men of government in the USSR pursue military studies and even assume the title of Marshal.

At the end of 1917 Lenin was convinced that war--in addition to its military nature--has shown all diplomatic, economic, social and psychological aspects, and considered furthermore as a good Marxist that war and revolution were in continual relationship.

The problem which he proposed to resolve was to find the means to transform world and imperialist war into civil war, not only in Russia but throughout the entire world.

Lenin had very little sympathy for the methods of the so-called peaceful revolution, since he was convinced that the workers had to seize power by force. Furthermore the first round of civil war in Russia had been won by force.

Peace was not an end in itself for Lenin; on the contrary, peace is no different from war as a political instrument.

Soviet Russia has never renounced making war by every possible means, political, economic, psychological, and when necessary, military. After its bitter experience of February and March of 1918, Lenin had proved that without sufficient armed forces, the other methods of warfare could not hope for anything but ephemeral success.

STALIN

Lenin's successor, Joseph Stalin, was a Marxist-Leninist of good standing and has as much influence as his predecessor in the field of revolutionary warfare.

~~SECRET~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

the party: policy of the smile, total denial of the dead dictator, peaceful coexistence, inciting to the establishment of people's fronts, without forgetting Christian progressivism, a call to all the negative forces of the West (anti-militarism, neutralism and pacifism), with the idea of transforming them into positive and active forces serving the USSR by upholding the Communist principle: "Everyone who is not our declared enemy can serve our designs. Who is not against us is with us; every man of good faith who is a disarmed ingenué, when faced by another man who has no scruple whatever in the accomplishment of his mission, and all one needs to know is by which end he must be taken".

It cannot be doubted that because of the burning desire for peace among men and women in the world, the Soviet leaders have had this ingenious idea, which does not compel Communism to end the Communist danger, but what is more important to them, that Communism postpone the danger of war--not the war of multiple fronts which be the ideal dreamed of by the world--but only military war of the standard type, which permits it to achieve at no risk whatever psychological warfare in all its fullness, multiform warfare, "chameleon warfare" a deep continuity in the analytical method of its purposed, a perpetual variation of the means which are both diverse and adapted to the situation.

MAO TSE-TUNG

In China only twenty years of patient effort were necessary for a handful of resolute men grouped around Mao Tse-Tung to conquer 700,000,000 Chinese.

Mao Tse-Tung, just as Marx and Engels and afterwards Lenin, has not hesitated to publish the secrets of his action. It is certain that his book, The Strategy of Revolutionary War in China, written in 1936 to train his general staff and his cadres intellectually, was recently published in Western Europe in 1950, that is, when victory was already assured. Although the case of China can happen in any other country of the Free World, how many western statesmen or military men have read and meditated on this book?

We must undoubtedly ask ourselves a question: "Why does the Communist Party disseminate this book in the West? The only acceptable answer is to instruct its partisans in the new and true methods.

The preface to the French translation says: "This essay on strategy which you are going to read and meditate is an example of extraordinary clarity, of depth of view, of mastery, of the powerful foresight which can be acquired after one grows to be a true Marxist."

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

With a wish to be brief, I shall cite only three passages from Mao's work. The first to demonstrate the fundamental nature of revolutionary war: "It is certainly correct" says Mao, "to say that a revolution or a revolutionary war begins from nothing and in order to achieve its existence, it grows from little to much, from birth to the development of lack of political power, to seizure of the same, from the absence of a Red Army to its establishment, and from the absence of regions controlled by Communists to their creation. Over this entire road, there must not be a single day in which one may take the defensive pure and simple." A second paragraph, in order to teach the fundamental importance given to the psychological factor, that is, the role of the inhabitants: "On the basis of our past experience," says Mao, "we must assure at least two of the conditions mentioned below during the phase of strategic withdrawal in order to consider that the situation is favorable to us and unfavorable to the enemy, so that we would be able to take the offensive. These conditions are:

- 1) Active support of the Red armed forces by the population.
- 2) Terrain favorable to operations.
- 3) Complete concentration of the principal forces of the Red armed forces.
- 4) Knowledge of the enemy's weak points.
- 5) A tired and demoralized enemy.
- 6) An enemy reduced to the extreme of making mistakes.

"The support of the population is the most important condition for the Red armed forces. The same is also indispensable in order to keep control of the lines of communication in a region.

"Thanks to the fulfillment of this condition, those indicated by numbers 4, 5, and 6 can be more easily created or uncovered. When the enemy launches a general offensive against the Red armed forces, the latter invariably withdraws from the territories of the Kuo Mintang toward the territories controlled by the Communists, because the population of the territories under Communist control actively supports the Red armed forces in their struggle against the white forces. There are furthermore other differences between the border regions and the center of the territory controlled by the Communists. In order to keep

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

information from filtering outside, to carry out reconnaissance, transportation and to take part in combat, etc., the inhabitants of the center are more secure than those in the border area. Thus, in the first, second, and third campaign of development and destruction, the regions in which support of the people was excellent were selected as the end location of the "withdrawal movement."

Lastly, I shall transcribe the third paragraph in order to prove finally the importance given to the "time factor".

"It is desirable to have a war which is decided quickly; generally, a long struggle is considered pernicious. However, the war in China must be carried on with the greatest patience and treated as a long war. During the period of "Lilisanism" our tactics of "boxing" meant that the great cities could not be taken except by an oscillating movement which was made to appear ridiculous. They made fun of us by saying that we might see the triumph of the revolution when our hair turned white. This revolutionary impatience proved to be false a long time ago."

KHRUSHCHEV AND "PEACEFUL COEXISTENCE"

Lenin has written the following: "While capitalism and socialism exist side by side, we cannot live in peace. In the long run, one or the other must triumph".

Professor Demetric Manuilsky of the Moscow War College, in his position as president of the Executive Committee of the Communist International, stated in 1931: "War to the death between Communism and Capitalism is inevitable. Our time will come in the next 20 or 30 years. In order to win, we must have an element of surprise. It will be a matter of putting the bourgeoisie to sleep, and with this purpose in mind, we shall launch the most sensational movement which ever existed by taking advantage of peacetime. It will involve electrifying proportions and extraordinary concessions. The stupid and degenerate Capitalist countries will work with a will for their own destruction. They will give us their friendship. Afterwards, when they are defenseless, we shall regroup all forces to destroy them."

On 8 February, 1955, the day when Khrushchev and Bulganin took power, Molotov, the Minister of Foreign Affairs, stated:

"We stand with the Leninist principles of coexistence." But a few months later, in his speech given to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a congress dedicated to coexistence, he said specifically: "...it is the Leninist combination of fidelity to principles and elasticity for the enforcement of foreign policy, which will

~~SECRET/NO FORN~~

~~SECRET / NO FORN~~

assure the success of our Party in the solution of international problems." (Pravda, 20 February 1956).

Nevertheless, it is well to compare these words with those pronounced by the same Molotov in 1941: "Coexistence between our Soviet State and the rest of the world is impossible in the long term. This antinomy can be solved only by weapons. The winner will be he who is strong enough to begin combat first."

On the other hand, Lenin said, "We must attain this objective (he refers to world victory of Communism) by any means, even by co-existence, if necessary, and temporary infiltration."

It is well to conciliate greater following of the ideas of Communism, with the elasticity necessary to make any indispensable practical compromises, to stimulate, to make treaties, to advance in zigzag form, withdraw, etc." (Lenin, Works in Russian, XXX, p 75)

To continue, I shall transcribe another paragraph by Lenin:

"It is well to be ready for any sacrifice, and if necessary, to be ready further, to employ every possible artifice, tricks and illegal methods, to keep silent on the truth, and dissimulate it, with the sole purpose of penetrating occupational associations, to remain inside the same and to fulfill at any price the work of Communist!" (Lenin - Selected Works, II, p 701)

But what we must not forget is that war, true war, is possible and is openly predicted by them, in the case that the "Capitalist countries" refuse to submit to their will, at the same time when they feel stronger than the West (Fig. 6a).

In this respect Lenin said the following: "When we shall be strong enough to win over Capitalism in its entirety, then we will seize it by the throat."

At the Fifteenth Session of the Party in 1927, Stalin was already saying: "We cannot forget the thesis of Lenin which emphasizes that the construction of the Socialist State depends on being able to postpone a war with the Capitalist States until it is inevitable."

On the other hand, we have seen that smiling Khrushchev speaks with the same "elasticity." His words are as follows: "It is quite probable that the process of installing socialism will be more and more varied. This does not absolutely mean that the achievement of this process is, at any cost, bound to Civil War. (Remember the close

~~SECRET / NO FORN~~

~~SECRET / NO FORN~~

connection between civil war and foreign war). Our enemies like to picture us, we Leninists, as being always and everywhere partisans of violence. It is true that we recognize the need for revolutionary transformations of capitalist society into socialist society. And this is what differentiates the revolutionary Marxists from the reformists and opportunists. There can be no doubt that the overthrow by violence of the bourgeois dictatorship, and the brutal aggravation of the struggle will be inevitable, but there are various forms of social revolution. Leninism teaches that the directing classes do not willingly seize power, but in the more or less great rigor of combat, the employment or failure to employ violence for the establishment of socialism does not depend so much on the proletariat as on the resistance of the exploiters and the employment of violence by themselves." That is, if the "exploiters", (which is the communist term for the free world) do not permit the Communists to make progress, we shall be responsible for war. The ideological bulletin of the Communist Party at the 20th Congress of the Party in the USSR, published the following with no comment.

"Peaceful co-existence, which means on one hand the continuous strengthening of the socialist front and its allies; and on the other hand the increase of difficulty for the imperialist system, offers the colonial peoples excellent conditions to begin struggle."

Further, Stalin had already expressed: "The utilization of nationalism for revolutionary purposes is the principal objective of our work. (Stalin: National and Colonial Questions, pp 178 and 187). Needless to say, the colonial peoples and more generally the under-developed nations thus become factors for revolutionary war and in a certain way the auxiliaries of Communism and the USSR.

Mao Tse-Tung has imparted the following directive: "The members of the Communist Party can, in politics, make a common front against imperialism with certain idealists, although they belong to a Church."

Lastly, peaceful co-existence is only the Machiavellian use of national sentiment and religious or social idealism as simple media to place the sum total of "capitalist" countries or more exactly "non-Communist" countries in condition to be rapidly destroyed.

Conclusions:

To conclude this explanation, the words of an unknown professor in France, appear applicable to the general situation today: "I have

~~SECRET / NO FORN~~

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

only read citations from Hegel, Clausewitz, Marx and Engels, Lenin, Stalin, Mao Tse-tung, Khrushchev, etc.,.

"The political-military thought of these men offers an absolute continuity. For 125 years not a decade has passed in which a work has not appeared which has been prophetic for us.

"The elite of half of humanity is nurtured on these books, powerfully stressing its political-military scope.

"It is incredible and criminal that the eyes and ears of the Western elite have not opened more.

"For 125 years our military thinkers have been concerned only with the strictly conventional aspect of war. But is it possible to act otherwise in nations that traditionally distrust the military?

"For 125 years our political men, our great schools of political-social training and in a general manner our universities have not considered it their duty to study this essential aspect of life and the future of humanity in order to alert public opinion. All this is simply criminal.

"Perhaps we still have time to understand that the whole world is at war and that this war is being gamed at all levels and that it neither concedes nor will concede any truce.

Finally, read the superb and sinister warning of Donoso Cortes: "When a people shows a civilized horror of war, it soon receives punishment for its error: God changes its sex, robs it of the public sign of virility, transforms it to a woman-people and then sends conquerors to carry off its honor."

~~SECRET/NOFORN~~

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP78-01634R000200010005-4

~~SECRET / NOFORN~~

~~SECRET / NOFORN~~

Sanitized - Approved For Release : CIA-RDP78-01634R000200010005-4